

dm



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,263	09/30/2002	Akira Ohmura	106121.01	5672
25944	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/065,263	Applicant(s) OHMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Nelson D. Hernandez	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/31/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features **“an exchangeable holder removably mounted on the universal base, the exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area of a specific one of the different models of digital cameras and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base”** must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

Art Unit: 2622

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "ADAPTOR HAVING EXCHANGEABLE HOLDER TO CONNECT DIFFERENT TYPES OF DIGITAL CAMERAS" or "DOCKING STATION HAVING EXCHANGEABLE HOLDER TO CONNECT DIFFERENT TYPES OF DIGITAL CAMERAS".

Response to Amendment

3. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on March 30, 2006. Claims 1, 9, 12, 13 and 14 have been amended. Claims 15 and 16 have been newly added.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 12, 13 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's arguments filed on March 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants argues that "Helot et al. does not disclose or suggest modifying the system of Berstis to result in the combination of features recited in claims 1, 9 and 12-14". The applicants argues that the adapters in Helot et al. are for different type of portable computers and not for use with digital cameras and that the holders are not shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area as claimed (See page 9, line 17 – page 10, line 3).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees, although the holders in Helot et al. are for use with portable computer, Helot et al. discloses the concept of using holder to adapt different types of electronic devices to a docking station in order to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device. Using that concept, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious to modify the docking station in Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras to the docking station obtaining similar advantages as shown in Helot. The Examiner noticed that the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in

Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 in view of Helot, US Patent 6,301,106 B1.**

Regarding claim 1, Berstis discloses a system (Fig. 1) for charging a battery (Fig. 2: 218) of, and for taking-out digital images from a memory (Fig. 2: 214) of a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102), the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 1: 106) for supplying the battery with electric power and for taking out the digital images from the memory of a digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to the system, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (bottom of the digital camera) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63).

Berstis fails to teach that the system comprises an exchangeable holder removable mounted on the universal base, the exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to a specific one of the different models of digital cameras and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers; Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is

Art Unit: 2622

designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

Regarding claim 2, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 1 teaches that the exchangeable holder is a tray having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to a lower portion of the specific model of digital camera (The combination of Berstis in view of Helot would result in an adapter having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to a the lower portion of the specific model of digital camera since the interface of the docking station in Berstis has an upper portion to be fitted to the lower portion of the digital camera where the interface of said digital camera is located). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 3, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 4, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 1 teaches a first electric connector to supply the battery with electric power and a second electric connector to take out the digital images from the memory, the first and the second connectors being designed to come into contact with the digital camera when the digital camera is laid on the tray (Berstis teaches that the digital camera comprises an electric connector (Fig. 2: 219) to supply the battery with electric power and another electric connector (Fig. 2: 217) to take out the images for the memory to be transferred to the personal computer by way of the docking station, which comprises an

Art Unit: 2622

electric connector (Fig. 1:108) to supply power to the battery of the digital camera and an electric connector (Fig. 1: 110) for transferring image data form the digital camera to the personal computer. The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 1 would result in the adapter having the same type of connections to adapt one of a plurality of different digital cameras into said docking station). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 5, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 4 teaches that the first and second connectors are located at the tray, and wherein the universal base includes a third standardized electric connector (See Berstis, fig. 1:108) to supply the battery with electric power through the first connector and a fourth standardized electric connector (See Berstis, fig. 1: 110) to take out the digital images from the memory through the second electric connector. Grounds for rejecting claim 4 apply here.

Regarding claim 6, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 3 teaches a first standardized electric connector to supply the battery with electric power and a second standardized electric connector to take out the digital images from the memory, the first and second standardized connectors are located at the universal base for a standardized coupling with the exchangeable holder (Berstis teaches that the digital camera comprises an electric connector (Fig. 2: 219) to supply the battery with electric power and another electric connector (Fig. 2: 217) to take out the images for the memory to be transferred to the personal computer by way of the docking station, which comprises an electric connector (Fig. 1:108) to supply power to

Art Unit: 2622

the battery of the digital camera and an electric connector (Fig. 1: 110) for transferring image data from the digital camera to the personal computer. The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 1 would result in the adapter having the same type of connections to adapt one of a plurality of different digital cameras into said docking station). Grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 7, Berstis discloses that the universal base leads to a power line (Fig. 1: 114; col. 3, lines 9-17).

Regarding claim 8, Berstis discloses that the universal base leads to a signal line (Fig. 1:116, col. 3, lines 9-17).

Regarding claim 9, Berstis discloses a system for a charging a battery of and for taking-out digital images from a memory of a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102), the system comprising: a universal base (Fig. 1: 106) for supplying the battery (Fig. 2: 218) with electric power and for taking out the digital images from the memory of the digital camera when the system is coupled to the digital camera, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (the bottom of the digital camera) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63).

Berstis fails to teach that the system charges a battery of and takes-out digital images from a memory of first and second models of digital cameras; a first exchangeable holder removably mountable on the universal base, the first exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to the first model of digital camera and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base; and a second exchangeable holder removably mountable on the universal base in place of the first

Art Unit: 2622

exchangeable holder, the second exchangeable holder being shaped to be fitted to the second model of digital camera and also standardized for being mounted on the universal base.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers. Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the

invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

Regarding claim 10, limitations can be found in claim 9.

Regarding claim 11, the combined teaching of the Berstis in view of Helot as applied to claim 9 teaches that the universal base includes a space for containing either of the first and second exchangeable holders, one of the first and second exchangeable holders being coupled with the universal base at a bottom of the space (The combination of Berstis in view of Helot would result in an adapter having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to a the lower portion of the specific model of digital camera since the interface of the docking station in Berstis has an upper portion to be fitted to the lower portion of the digital camera where the interface of said digital camera is located). Grounds for rejecting claim 9 apply here.

Regarding claim 12, Berstis discloses a set including a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) and a universal base (Fig. 1: 106) to form a system for receiving the digital camera, the set comprising: a digital camera of a specific shape at its lower portion the digital camera having a battery (Fig. 2: 218), wherein the universal base fit the lower

Art Unit: 2622

portion of said camera, wherein the lower portion of the digital camera being a surface of the digital camera that does not have a maximum area of the digital camera; and a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the battery being charged through the system, and digital images in the memory being taken out through the system; said universal base comprises an upper portion for fitting the lower portion of the digital camera so as to exchange image data and power from/to the digital camera (Using connector shown in fig. 2: 217) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63).

Berstis fails to teach a holder being couplable to the universal base, said holder having an upper portion shaped to be fitted to the lower portion of the digital camera, wherein the holder has a standardized coupler for attachment with the universal base.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers. Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis to have the docking station with a plurality of adapters to fit the lower part of different types of digital cameras in order to fit said holder to the upper part of the docking station so the docking station could exchange image data and recharge the battery of each of the different types of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

Regarding claim 13, Berstis discloses a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) of a specific shape at its lower portion, the digital camera having a battery (Fig. 2: 218) and a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the digital camera being couplable with a universal base (Fig. 1: 106) to form a system through which the battery is charged and digital images in the memory are taken out when the digital camera is coupled to the system, wherein the

universal base fit the lower portion of said camera, wherein the lower portion of the digital camera being a surface of the digital camera that does not have a maximum area of the digital camera (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63).

Berstis fails to teach a holder for the digital camera, said holder being couplable to the universal base, wherein said holder comprises: an upper portion shaped to be fitted to the lower portion of the digital camera and a standardized coupler for coupling with the universal base.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers. Helot also teaches that the adapters can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking

station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

Regarding claim 15, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as discussed and analyzed in claim 1, teaches that all models of digital cameras that use the universal base have a specified exchangeable holder. Therefore, grounds for rejecting claim 1 apply here.

Regarding claim 16, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot as discussed and analyzed in claim 9, teaches that all models of digital cameras that use the universal base have a specified exchangeable holder. Therefore, grounds for rejecting claim 9 apply here.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 in view of Helot, US Patent 6,301,106 B1 and further in view of Niikawa, US Patent 6,947,075 B1.

Regarding claim 14, Berstis discloses a digital camera system comprising a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214), the holder system comprising: a digital image storage (personal computer; col. 2, lines 15-39) for communicating with the digital camera when the digital camera is coupled to said digital image storage by using a universal base (Fig. 1: 106), wherein the digital image storage includes a storage medium (A storage medium is inherent in a personal computer to store data) that stores the taken out digital images, wherein the universal base is shaped to fit a surface that is not a surface with a maximum area (the bottom of the digital camera) (Col. 1, lines 45-61; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 5-63)

Berstis fails to teach holders for a first and second models of digital cameras to be coupled to said first and second models of digital cameras for communicating to a digital image storage by using said holders, wherein the digital image storage includes a function unit having a program for taking out the digital images, the program being used when taking out the digital images in the first and the second models of digital cameras.

However, Helot teaches a docking station (Fig. 1) having a plurality of adapter trays (Fig. 8) for a plurality of portable computers, wherein said plurality of adapter trays are configured for respective different type of portable computer so the data interface would match to the one in the docking station in order to exchange data and power from/to each of the plurality of portable computers. Helot also teaches that the adapters

can be labeled in order to easily identify to which type of portable computer belongs (Col. 2, line 55 – col. 4, line 37; col. 4, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 17-26; col. 6, lines 33-39). Using exchangeable holders to adapt different type of electronic devices to a docking station is advantageous because it would reduce the number and variety of docking station products required to establish communication between the electronic device and an external device.

Although the teaching of Helot is for a portable computer and not for a digital camera, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the concept taught in Helot to Berstis so the docking station may have a plurality of adapters for different digital cameras so the docking station could transfer image data and recharge the battery of each of the plurality of digital cameras. Although the holders in Helot are shaped to fit the back of the electronic device (portable computer), however, when modifying the teaching of Berstis to adapt different types of digital cameras using the concept taught in Helot et al., the invention would result in a docking station having different holders that would fit in the bottom part of the digital (the bottom part of the camera being the surface that is not the surface with the maximum area) camera because the docking station in Berstis is designed to receive a digital camera having the interface connectors located at the bottom of the camera, thus the holder adapted for the docking station in Berstis needs to fit the bottom part of the digital camera since that is the part being fitted by the docking station. The motivation to do so would have been to reduce the number and variety of docking station products required as suggested by Helot (Col. 2, lines 3-14).

The combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot fails to teach that the image storage includes a function unit having a program for taking out the digital images, the program being used when taking out the digital images in the first and the second models of digital cameras.

However, Niikawa teaches a photographic apparatus (Figs. 1-4) connectable to a computer (Fig. 5: 1000), wherein said computer comprises software installed in the hard drive (Fig. 5: HD1) for detecting the connection of the digital camera in order to permit transmission of images and control of the digital camera upon connection of said digital camera. Niikawa teaches that upon detection, the computer run a software for controlling operations of the digital camera (i.e. image transmission) (Col. 3, lines 17-46; col. 4, line 50 – col. 5, line 14; col. 6, line 63 – col. 7, line 60). Having a program to control the transfer of image data from the digital camera to the data storage is advantageous because it would provide a digital camera to easily and rapidly use the network sources by manipulations on the digital camera side, without adding special functions and performances to the digital camera so the digital camera can be kept compact without increasing power consumption.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Helot and further in view of Niikawa as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the holder system by having the digital image storage detecting when the digital camera is connected to said digital image storage and to run a software for controlling function in the digital camera. The motivation to do so would have been to provide a photographing apparatus taught by

Art Unit: 2622

Berstis and Helot which can easily and rapidly use the network sources by manipulations on the digital camera side, without adding special functions and performances to the digital camera so the digital camera can be kept compact without increasing power consumption as suggested by Niikawa (Col. 1, line 65 – col. 2, line 26).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
May 25, 2006


TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER